

## **REMARKS**

### **Entry of Amendment**

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered at this time. Except as explained in detail below, Applicants are amending the claims to clarify the claimed invention.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### **Claim Objections**

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner objects to Claims 41-42, 44-45 and 49 for informalities therein. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent Claim 41 to delete the language objected to by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that this overcomes the Examiner's objection, and it is requested that the objection be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

#### **Claims 26-27, 30-31 and 35**

The Examiner also rejects Claims 26-27, 30-31 and 35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda (US 6,078,071) in view of Oikawa et al. (US 4,619,695) and Shindo et al. (US 5,667,665). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 26 and 31 to recite the features of "forming a first gate insulating film comprising silicon nitride" and "forming a second gate

insulating film over the first gate insulating film.” Applicants are further amending Claim 31 to add the feature of “forming an insulating layer to protect the channel forming region over the channel forming region.” These features are supported by, for example, Embodiment 15 (page 45, line 1 - page 46, line 10 in the substitute specification; Fig. 32) in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest these features.

Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the method of Claims 26 and 31 and those claims dependent thereon, and the claims are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 29-30, 32 and 34-35

The Examiner also rejects Claims 29-30, 32 and 34-35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa and Shindo and further in view of Brodsky et al. (US 6,245,668). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claims 26 and 31, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 36 and 41

The Examiner also rejects Claims 36 and 41 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa and Shindo and further in view of Kobeda et al. (US 5,208,170). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 36 and 41 in a similar manner to Claim

26, as discussed above. As explained above, these amended features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Further, Applicants have added the features of “crystallizing the semiconductor film” to Claim 36 and “the crystallized semiconductor film comprises ... a second impurity region having a second impurity concentration lower than the first impurity concentration” to Claim 41. It is respectfully submitted that these features are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claims 36 and 41 and those claims dependent thereon, and these claims are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 37, 39-40, 42 and 44-45

The Examiner also rejects Claims 37, 39-40 and 44-45 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of Oikawa, Shindo, and Koeda and further in view of Brodsky. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 46-49

The Examiner also rejects Claims 46-49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “the cited references, as applied above, and further in view of” Mizuno et al. (US 5,840,366). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

For at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568